

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

KAREEM JABBAR-EL, ex rel.,)	
KAREEM JABBAR ROCK, ESTATE,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	Civil Action No. 2:21-cv-1734
)	
v.)	District Judge Robert J. Colville
)	
CHRISTY CRISWELL WIEGAND,)	Chief United States Magistrate Judge
WARDEN OF NORTHEAST OHIO)	Cynthia Reed Eddy
CORRECTIONAL CENTER,)	
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR)	
THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF)	
PENNSYLVANIA, and)	
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE)	
UNITED STATES,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

ORDER OF COURT

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 14) issued by Chief United States Magistrate Judge Cynthia Reed Eddy. Judge Eddy’s Report and Recommendation recommends that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 2) filed by Petitioner, Kareem Jabbar-El, ex rel., Kareem Jabbar Rock, Estate, be dismissed with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction, and further recommends that Petitioner’s Motion to Strike (ECF No. 10) and Motion to Vacate Judgment (ECF No. 13) be denied. Petitioner filed Objections (ECF No. 15) to the Report and Recommendation on April 5, 2022. This matter is now ripe for disposition.

Objections to a magistrate judge’s disposition of a dispositive matter are subject to de novo review before the district judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)-(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The reviewing district court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation to which objections are made. *Id.* Following de novo review, “[t]he district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further

evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has explained that, “even absent objections to the report and recommendation, a district court should ‘afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report,’” and has “described this level of review as ‘reasoned consideration.’” *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Long Branch*, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987)).

Upon review of Judge Eddy’s Report and Recommendation and Petitioner’s Objections, as well as a review of the record in this matter, it is hereby ORDERED as follows:

The Court agrees with the well-reasoned analysis set forth in Judge Eddy’s Report and Recommendation, and the Court accepts and adopts Judge Eddy’s Report and Recommendation in its entirety as the opinion of the Court with respect to Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Motion to Strike, and Motion to Vacate Judgment. Petitioner’s Objections are meritless, and are overruled on that basis. It is hereby further ORDERED, for the reasons discussed in the Report and Recommendation, that Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is dismissed with prejudice. Any request for injunctive relief made by way of Petitioner’s Objections is denied on the same basis. Petitioner’s Motion to Strike is denied. Petitioner’s Motion to Vacate Judgment is denied. The Clerk of Court shall mark this case CLOSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Robert J. Colville
Robert J. Colville
United States District Judge

Dated: May 6, 2022

cc/ecf: All counsel of record

Kareem Jabbar-El
434 Douglas Blvd.
Richmond Heights, OH 44143